REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 9, 12, 15-18, 20, and 21 remain in this application, and claims 4, 6-8, 10-11, 13-14, 19, and 22-29 are canceled. Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 19 and 24-28 are canceled above, and the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, set forth in section 3 on pages 2-3 of the Office Action is moot.

Claims 22 and 28 are canceled above, and the rejections based on prior art set forth in sections 5 and 9 of the Office Action are also moot.

Independent claim 1 is rejected, along with certain dependent claims, as unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,356,340 to Miller et al. in view of U.S. Patent 3,405,539 to Tanaka. Reconsideration is requested.

Currently amended claim 1 incorporates limitations previously appearing in claims 4, 6, and 7, as well as limitations relating to features discussed, for example, in specification paragraph 0020. Axes 21 and 22, defining axes of rotation as now specified in claim 1, are indicated by way of example in Figure 1 of the present invention, and it is clear from Figure 1 that the axes 21 and 22 run parallel but at a distance from one another. The flexible shaft portion 17 is provided with cross-sectional weakenings 23 over the entire length thereof to provide for this feature. The Tanaka rotary joint is inapplicable to a configuration as presently defined by claim 1, since the Tanaka segments 12 and 14 bend substantially only as shown in Figure 2. The Tanaka joint is inappropriate for use in a door lock system in which two rotational axes, for drive input and output, run in parallel and at a distance from one another. These

features are also absent from the Miller et al. drive shaft which, moreover, lacks any cross-sectional weakening as claim 1 now requires. It is respectfully submitted that the Miller et al. and Tanaka patents, taken as a whole, fail to suggest a door lock for a motor vehicle comprising, in addition to the other elements specified, a torque transmitting device which connects a locking cylinder with a coupling member and which has a bendable shaft section allowing compensation for an offset between first and second axes of rotation and having cross-sectional weakenings extending and constructed as defined by currently amended claim 1.

Neither U.S. Patent 3,472,045 to Nelsen et al. nor any of the other secondary references relied on by the Examiner in the various rejections set forth in the Office Action suggests further modifying the Miller et al. drive shaft so as to meet the limitations discussed. The Miller et al. flexible drive shaft, moreover, has no cross-sectional weakenings.

It is submitted that claim 1, as it appears above, is patentable. The rest of the claims remaining in this application depend on claim 1 and are patentable as well.

If there are any questions regarding this amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated since this should expedite the prosecution of the application for all concerned.

Respectfully submitted,

October 18, 2005

Richard R. Diefendorf
Registration No. 32,390

CROWELL & MORING LLP
Intellectual Property Group
P.O. Box 14300
Washington, DC 20044-4300
Telephone No.: (202) 624-2500
Facsimile No.: (202) 628-8844
RRD:rd